

OPINION 1861

***Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797] and *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda): specific names conserved**

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Cephalopoda; common octopus; common squid; *Octopus vulgaris*; *Loligo vulgaris*.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary powers the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:
 - (a) *octopodia* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sepia octopodia*;
 - (b) *octopus* Gmelin, [1791], as published in the binomen *Sepia octopus*;
 - (c) *loligo* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sepia loligo*.
- (2) The name *Loligo* Lamarck, 1798 (gender: masculine), type species *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 by subsequent designation by Children (1823), is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The entry for *Octopus* Cuvier, [1797] on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology is hereby emended to record that its type species by absolute tautonymy is *Sepia octopus* Gmelin, [1791] (suppressed senior objective synonym of *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797]).
- (4) The name *vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798, as published in the binomen *Loligo vulgaris* (specific name of the type species of *Loligo* Lamarck, 1798), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (5) The entry for *Octopus vulgare* (recte *vulgaris*) Cuvier, [1797] on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology is hereby emended to record that *vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797] is the valid junior objective synonym of *Sepia octopus* Gmelin, [1791], the type species of *Octopus* Cuvier, [1797].
- (6) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:
 - (a) *octopodia* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sepia octopodia* and as suppressed in (1)(a) above;
 - (b) *octopus* Gmelin, [1791], as published in the binomen *Sepia octopus* and as suppressed in (1)(b) above;
 - (c) *loligo* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sepia loligo* and as suppressed in (1)(c) above.

History of Case 2922

An application for the conservation of the specific names of *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797] and *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 was received from Dr Angel Guerra (*Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas (CSIC), Vigo (Pontevedra), Spain*) and Dr Miguel A. Alonso-Zarazaga (*Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (CSIC), Madrid, Spain*) on 29 December 1993. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 52: 24–26 (March 1995). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

Comments in support of the application from Prof D.T. Donovan (*University College London, London, U.K.*), from Drs Michael Vecchione & Michael J. Sweeney

(National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.), and from Dr J.B. Messenger (The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, U.K.), were published in BZN 52: 333–335 (December 1995).

A further comment in support from Dr Marion Nixon (Birkbeck College, London, U.K.) was published in BZN 53: 45 (March 1996).

In their comment (BZN 52: 334) Vecchione & Sweeney considered that Huddesford (in Lister, 1770), and not Lamarck (1798), was the first author to make available the generic name *Loligo*.

The generic name *Octopus* and the name of its type species *Octopus vulgare* (recte *vulgaris*), both of Cuvier [1797], were placed on Official Lists in Opinion 233 (April 1954). However, the senior specific names of *Sepia octopodia* Linnaeus, 1758 and *S. octopus* Gmelin, [1791] were not then considered.

Decision of the Commission

On 16 September 1996 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 52: 25. At the close of the voting period on 16 December 1996 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 24: Bock, Bouchet, Brothers, Cocks, Cogger, Eschmeyer, Heppell, Kabata, Kerzhner, Kraus, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahner, Martins de Souza, Mawatari, Minelli, Nielsen, Nye, Papp, Patterson, Savage, Schuster, Song, Štys

Negative votes — none.

Dupuis abstained.

Ride was on leave of absence.

Abstaining, Dupuis commented: 'I refuse to vote on this case because in my personal view the time between the last comment and the distribution of voting papers was too short. The last comment was less than one year old'. [Editorial note. The comment was one of support. An explanation of procedure followed in sending cases for voting is given on pp. 53–54]. Voting for, Bouchet commented: 'This is an exemplary case where zoological names are used in non-taxonomical and even non-zoological literature. I am happy to deviate from the principle of priority in such well-founded cases'.

Heppell commented: 'The citation in the application of the method of type fixation for *Octopus* is still incorrect (cf. para. 2). Cuvier ([1797]) cited *Sepia octopus* Gmelin and that nominal species is the type by absolute tautonymy (Article 68e of the Code), regardless of whether or not that name is ruled to be invalid. Its currently valid name is *Octopus vulgaris*. [The method of type fixation is correct in the ruling].

While I agree with the purpose of this application, I would regard *Sepia octopodia* and *S. loligo* of Linnaeus (1758) as nomina dubia rather than senior synonyms of *Octopus vulgaris* and *Loligo vulgaris* respectively. *Sepia octopodia* was almost certainly an amalgam of all octopods known in the 18th century, including what would subsequently be named *Eledone cirrhosa*, *E. moschata*, and *Octopus rugosus* as well as *O. vulgaris*. Some later authors (for example, Pennant, 1777, *British Zoology*, Ed. 4, vol. 4) used the name with reference to *Eledone*. It is not true that the name *Octopus octopodia* has been unused for over a century (para. 3; cf. Winkworth, 1928, 'The hectocotylus of *Octopus octopodia* (L.)'. *Proceedings of the Malacological Society of London*, 18: 49–50). *Sepia loligo* was similarly an undifferentiated mixture

of squids. Linnaeus's observation '... cauda extra aquam exsilit' certainly fits the behaviour of ommastrephid squid such as *Todarodes sagittatus* better than any species of *Loligo*. Nevertheless I do agree that both names should now be suppressed under the plenary powers.

I disagree totally with Vecchione & Sweeney's (BZN 52: 334) ill-advised proposal to credit Huddesford (1770) with the authorship of the name *Loligo*. I suspect that 'Loligo' there is a Latin vernacular. This spelling (instead of the classical 'lolligo') was used by 16th century authors such as Rondeletius. The Huddesford indexes are certainly known to malacologists and rightly, I believe, ignored as a source of names. Sherborn (*Index Animalium 1758-1800*) included Huddesford's edition of Lister's work but did not accept 'Loligo' before Lamarck's (1798) use of the name'.

Kerzhner commented: 'I strongly disapprove of accepting 'Loligo' as an available name from Huddesford (in Lister, 1770). The heading 'Loligo a Sleeve' on pl. 9 of Lister's anatomical figures has 'Loligo' and 'a Sleeve' printed in different type faces and are the names in Latin and in English for the animal, as is clear from the text on pl. 10: 'Loliginis anatomicae anglice a Sleeve dictae' (anatomy of *Loligo* named Sleeve in English). However, a Latin name in a Latin text is not necessarily a scientific name; nor is a capital letter for 'Loligo' evidence for its use as a generic name because a capital letter was also used for the English word 'Sleeve'. Apart from 'Loligo', there are some other Latin names ('Pomatia' and 'Purpura', for example) written in a similar format which are universally attributed as scientific generic names to later authors. Hence, the erroneous acceptance of Lister (1770) as a source for *Loligo* would have implications for other names also'.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Loligo Lamarck, 1798, *Bulletin des Sciences, par la Société Philomatique de Paris*, 17: 130.

loligo, *Sepia*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae...*, Ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 659.

octopodia, *Sepia*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae...*, Ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 658.

octopus, *Sepia*, Gmelin, [1791], *Caroli a Linné Systema Naturae*, Ed. 13, vol. 1, part 6 (Vermes), p. 3149.

vulgaris, *Loligo*, Lamarck, 1798, *Bulletin des Sciences, par la Société Philomatique de Paris*, 17: 130.

The following is the reference for the designation of *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 as the type species of the nominal genus *Loligo* Lamarck, 1798:

Children, J.G. 1823. *Lamarck's genera of shells*, p. 16.